
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2019

by Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/19/3227187
27 Telferscot Road, London SW12 0HW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Natalie Brewster against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 18/05021/FUL, dated 20 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is a mansard roof extension to rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area, with particular regard to the rear roofscape.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an upper floor flat within a late 19th/early 20th century two-storey terraced row. The Hyde Farm Conservation Area in this locality is characterised by residential flats that are generally uniform in appearance, with paired two-storey projections to the rear, constructed in brick with predominantly unaltered pitched slate roofs. The effect of the proposal would be to introduce a mansard across the full width of the site.
4. From my observations on site, I found that even the rear elevations of the terraced rows make a positive contribution to the conservation area. The uniformity of the terraced row to the rear is visually striking. The only changes to the roofscape that I was able to see from the public realm and the rear lane were relatively small and neatly detailed single dormers installed within the existing pitched roof plane. Given this context, the installation of a full width mansard would unbalance the existing strong and regular rhythm of the roof.
5. Notwithstanding whether the proposal would generally comply with the Council's Lambeth Building Alterations and Extension Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on rear mansard extensions, this is guidance only and is qualified as not appropriate for heritage assets, which includes conservation areas. As further noted in Annex 1 of the SPD, mansard roofs were not in favour at the time of the terrace being built. They are not typical to the building style. Overall, the introduction of the proposed mansard would be to

the detriment of the positive contribution that the existing rear roofscape makes to the significance of the conservation area, notwithstanding that the ridge height would be maintained. Whilst amendments have been made to the previous dismissed appeal¹ at the same site, this does not change my findings.

6. Reference is also made to two appeal decisions at Nos 17 and 31 Fieldhouse Road². However, the limited extracts provided to me make reference, firstly, at No 17 to an already unbalanced symmetry and, secondly, at No 31 to a number of such mansard roof extensions in the area. These are not situations which I find reflected at the appeal site and its locality, which is relatively unchanged. Other delegated permissions are also mentioned, but I have not been provided with sufficient information of these to make a clear comparison, although I note they all relate to the same side of Fieldhouse Road as the two appeal decisions. In any case, I must determine the current appeal on its merits.
7. The appellant has cited a number of benefits arising from the proposal. The use of exterior detailing to match existing and the lack of objection from the local community are matters that would have a neutral effect. Whilst improved thermal performance, sustainability, and enlarged accommodation provision are considerable benefits, I must give great weight to any harm to the designated asset. Whilst harm to the significance of the Conservation Area is less than substantial, in the words of the National Planning Policy Framework, the suggested benefits are not sufficient to outweigh that harm.
8. I conclude that the development fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, with particular regard to the rear roofscape. Accordingly, in this regard, the proposal would conflict with Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of Lambeth's Local Plan and paragraph 4.20 of the Lambeth Building Alterations and Extension Supplementary Planning Document. Together, these policies require that development is of a high design quality that maintains local distinctiveness, amongst other considerations.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Patrick Hanna

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal decision APP/N5660/W/18/3204551

² Appeal decisions APP/N5660/D/17/3176258 and APP/N5660/W/18/3210324